UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/660,639 | 09/12/2003 | Masayuki Yoshida | 01272.020631 | 7109 |

5514 7590 02/22/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| DICKERSON, CHAD S | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 02/22/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/660,639 | YOSHIDA, MASAYUKI | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Chad Dickerson | 2625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/27/2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *20-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, see page 7, filed 11/27/2007, with respect to the specification objection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the specification has been withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 7, filed 11/27/2007, with respect to the claim objections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections of the claims have been withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 7, filed 11/27/2007, with respect to 112 2nd paragraph rejections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 112 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 2 has been withdrawn.

*4.* Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With regard to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner still believes that the reference of Cedar discloses the feature of disclosing a font size based on the scaling factor, since the font size of Cedar is determined based on the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor (see rejection below). Also, as shown in figure 4, the system can also determine if the font size calculated in the system is below a minimum value of the theoretical font size. However, because of the Amendment, the reference of Hino is used to disclose the other claim features.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 20, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar '650 (6256650) in view of Hino '788 (US Pub No 2002/0036788).

Re claim 20: Cedar '650 discloses a document printing system (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation unit for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision unit for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation unit is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system

calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision unit determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation unit is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting unit for adjusting the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation unit (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height

is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the functions of a second calculation unit for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the

character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

Re claim 24: Cedar '650 discloses a document printing method (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation step for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision step for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range

from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation step for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision step determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting step for adjusting the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation step (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

Re claim 28: Cedar '650 discloses a computer-readable medium storing thereon a computer program for instructing a computer to execute a method for document printing (see col. 10, lines 7-9) comprising:

a first calculation step for calculating a font size based on a scaling factor of an output area (i.e. in the system, the fullness ratio, considered analogous to the scaling factor since it is the ratio of height or width of the editable text and the text frame, is used to determine the theoretical font size in the system. With the font size being scaled based on the fullness ratio, the calculation of the theoretical font size is based on the fullness ratio. The fullness ratio can account for a text frame output area or the whole amount of the display screen, considered as the output area. The functions of the first calculation unit and other units in the system are performed by the many program modules stored in the drives (110, 113, 114 and 109) that are executed by the CPU (102); see col. 10, lines 36-67, col. 11, line 1 – col. 12, line 47);

a decision step for deciding whether the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than a minimum font size or not (i.e. when the system calculates the theoretical font size, the system determines whether this font size is between the maximum and minimum allowed theoretical font sizes. This can apply to a scenario where the theoretical font size can be greater than the max or smaller than the minimum theoretical font size. When the theoretical font size lies outside the range from the max or min, the system adjusts the theoretical font size according to the method in column 20; see col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14);

a second calculation step for calculating an expansion for expanding the font size to the font size (i.e. when the system determines that the theoretical font size is not between the minimum and maximum value allowed, the system either expands the font size if it is lower than the minimum or reduces the size if it is larger than the max, to a size that is halfway between the min and max theoretical values; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14) when said decision step determines that the font size calculated by said first calculation step is smaller than the minimum font size (i.e. in the system, the theoretical font size can be determined to be smaller than the minimum theoretical font size and the font size be magnified to a different size. This is shown in figure 4; see figs. 2-5; col. 16, line 60 – col. 17, line 22 and col. 19, line 13 – col. 20, line 14); and

an adjusting step for adjusting the output area based on the expansion calculated by said second calculation step (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and expansion ratio.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hino '788. Hino '788 discloses a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the

font size to the minimum font size (i.e. shown in figure 24, the size of the characters are determined, which is considered analogous to font size. The minimum of the character sizes are also detected in the system. With the system first detecting that the character is a minimum size of 6 points and secondly detecting that the desired minimum size is 8 point characters that are needed in the document, the system calculates a magnification ratio to apply to the characters to expand the characters to the minimum size of 8 points. The magnification rate is considered to be 8/6; see fig. 24; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]) and expansion ratio (i.e. the magnification ratio is considered as the expansion ratio; paragraphs [0172]-[0183]).

Therefore, in view of Hino '788, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of a second calculation step for calculating an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size and an expansion ratio in order to have a magnification ratio to enlarge the character to the detected minimum character size (as stated in Hino '788 paragraph [0176]).

7. Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar '650, as modified by Hino '788, as applied to claims 20, 24 and 28 above, and further in view of Hertzfeld '824 (US Pat No 6441824).

Re claim 21: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach the document printing system as claimed in claim 20, further comprising a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses further comprising a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a changing unit for changing a font type according to the font size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 22: The teachings of Cedar '650, modified by Hino '788, and further in view of Hertzfeld '824 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach the document printing system as claimed in claim 21, wherein said changing unit changes the font type to Gothic when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses wherein said changing unit changes the font type to Gothic when the font

type is smaller than a predetermined size (i.e. in the system, the display starts out with a certain size of characters. However, after the display has a certain number of characters entered on the display, the characters are smaller than the first size applied, which is considered as a predetermined size. Once the data field is full and goes to a smaller size, both the character style and size changes since it is smaller than the first size. The style includes the font type and the font type can be changed to gothic since the style may change; see fig. 3; col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein said changing unit changes the font type to Gothic when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 25: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach the document printing method as claimed in claim 24, further comprising a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses further comprising a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which

combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have method step of a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 26: The teachings of Cedar '650, modified by Hino '788, and further in view of Hertzfeld '824 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach the document printing method as claimed in claim 25, wherein said the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses wherein the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size (i.e. in the system, the display starts out with a certain size of characters. However, after the display has a certain number of characters entered on the display, the characters are smaller than the first size applied, which is considered as a predetermined size. Once the data field is full and goes to a smaller size, both the character style and size changes since it is smaller than the first

size. The style includes the font type and the font type can be changed to gothic since the style may change; see fig. 3; col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of wherein the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 29: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach the computer-readable medium as claimed in claim 28, wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font size (i.e. in the system, the changing of the font type can occur in addition to changing the font size. Both the font type and size can be varied depending on which combination of the two attributes fits the display area available; see col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of wherein the method further comprises a changing step for changing a font type according to the font

size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

Re claim 30: The teachings of Cedar '650, modified by Hino '788, and further in view of Hertzfeld '824 are disclosed above.

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach the document printing method as claimed in claim 29, wherein the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Hertzfeld '824. Hertzfeld '824 discloses wherein the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a predetermined size (i.e. in the system, the display starts out with a certain size of characters. However, after the display has a certain number of characters entered on the display, the characters are smaller than the first size applied, which is considered as a predetermined size. Once the data field is full and goes to a smaller size, both the character style and size changes since it is smaller than the first size. The style includes the font type and the font type can be changed to gothic since the style may change; see fig. 3; col. 1, line 45 – col. 2, line 2 and col. 4, lines 3-50).

Therefore, in view of Hertzfeld '824, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of wherein the font type is changed to Gothic in said changing step when the font type is smaller than a

predetermined size in order to find a combination of the font size and type that allows information to fit within the display area available (as stated in Hertzfeld '824).

8. Claims 23, 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar '650, as modified by Hino '788, as applied to claims 20, 24 and 28 above, and Hertzfeld '824, and further in view of Ariki '492 (US Pat No 5113492).

Re claim 23: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above. Cedar '650 discloses the document printing system as claimed in claim 20, wherein said adjusting unit adjusts the output area (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Ariki '492. Ariki '492 discloses such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted (i.e. in figure 7 is shown a page that is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted on a CRT or a printing device (70) in the system. The invention of Ariki deals with the processing of image data that can be separated into blocks of image data within a page in the system; see figs. 6 and 7; col. 49 – col. 7, line 5).

Therefore, in view of Ariki '492, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature such that the output area is

divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted in order to have a document displayed consists of several pages (as stated in Ariki '492 col. 6, lines 49-65).

Re claim 27: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above. Cedar '650 discloses the document printing method as claimed in claim 24, wherein the output area is adjusted in said adjusting step (i.e. in the system, the area where the characters are output can be resized by the resize height determined by the system. The resize height is used to resize the text frame where the image data is output, considered as the output area; see col. 11, lines 1-12).

However, Cedar '650 fails to teach such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Ariki '492. Ariki '492 discloses such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted (i.e. in figure 7 is shown a page that is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted on a CRT or a printing device (70) in the system. The invention of Ariki deals with the processing of image data that can be separated into blocks of image data within a page in the system; see figs. 6 and 7; col. 49 – col. 7, line 5).

Therefore, in view of Ariki '492, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of the method step such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted in order to have a document displayed consists of several pages (as stated in Ariki '492 col. 6, lines 49-65).

Re claim 31: The teachings of Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 are disclosed above. Cedar '650 discloses the document printing method as claimed in claim 28, wherein the output area is adjusted in said adjusting step

However, Cedar '650 in view of Hino '788 fails to teach such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Ariki '492. Ariki '492 discloses such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted (i.e. in figure 7 is shown a page that is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted on a CRT or a printing device (70) in the system. The invention of Ariki deals with the processing of image data that can be separated into blocks of image data within a page in the system; see figs. 6 and 7; col. 49 – col. 7, line 5).

Therefore, in view of Ariki '492, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have such that the output area is divided into a plurality of pages to be outputted in order to have a document displayed consists of several pages (as stated in Ariki '492 col. 6, lines 49-65).

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Miura '831 (US Pat No 6081831) discloses a system where text data detected is compared to a font size to see if it is above or below a minimum font size. The system

then calculates a magnification ratio to magnify the font if it is smaller than the minimum font size.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Dickerson whose telephone number is (571)-270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Thur. 9:00-6:30 Fri. 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571)-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CD/ CD
Chad Dickerson
February 13, 2008

Gabriel Garcia

GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER